

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in light of the changes above and the arguments below.¹ By this Amendment, claims 1, 12, 14, 17, 28, 39, 41, 44, 48, 52, 54, 55 & 57 have been amended, claims 11 & 38 have been cancelled, and claims 58-64 have been added. Independent claims 1, 17, 28, 44, 48, 52, 54, 55 & 57 incorporate subject matter previously recited in cancelled claims 11 & 38. Claims 12, 14, 39 & 41 have been amended to update their dependency. Support for the subject matter of new claims 58-64 may be found in the as-filed specification at, for example, pages 7-9, paragraphs 0018-0020. Claims 1, 12, 14, 16, 17, 27, 28, 39, 41, 43, 44, 47, 48 & 51-64 are now pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,014,660 to *Lim et al.* (“*Lim*”). *Lim* cannot support a rejection of claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) because it does not disclose each and every element of the claim in as complete detail as contained in the claim. (*See* M.P.E.P. § 2131 (8th Ed., rev. 7, July 2008.)

Lim discloses a system for performing DNS translations including, *inter alia*, a DNS server system 102, a client system 202, and a special DNS server system 302. (*Lim*, Abstract; Fig. 1.) The Office Action points to the method illustrated in Figure 5 for allegedly disclosing the subject matter of claim 52. According to Figure 5, DNS server system 102 receives a translation request, including a symbolic name, from client system 202. (*Id.* at col. 6:49-55; Fig. 5, step. 502.) DNS server system 102 then searches DNS database 116 for records associated with the symbolic name. (*Id.* at col. 6:55-61; Fig. 5, step. 504.) If a record is found, DNS server system 102 determines whether the record includes a “binding” between the symbolic name and an IP address. (*Id.* at cols. 6:64-7:7; Fig. 5, step. 510.) In

¹ The Office Action contains statements characterizing the claims and related art. Regardless of whether any such statements are specifically addressed herein, Applicant's silence as to these characterizations should not be construed as acceptance of them.

such case, DNS server system 102 returns the IP address to client system 202. (*Id.* at col. 7:8-13; Fig. 5, 512.) Otherwise, if no IP address is found, the method may attempt to find the IP address in another manner. (*Id.* at col. 7:14-16.) In one method, relied on in the Office Action to reject claim 52, the translation request from client system 202 is examined to determine whether recursive translation was requested. (*Id.* at col. 11:7-17, Fig. 5, step 530.) If so, DNS server system 102 passes the translation request from client system 202 to another, “higher level” DNS server system 102, which apparently performs the translation and returns the translated name to client computer system 202. (*Id.* at col. 11:7-17, Fig. 5, step 532.)

Claim 52 recites, *inter alia*, searching a local storage of the client computer system for the network address of the server computer; performing a backup search procedure if the network address of the server computer is not found by the client computer using a primary search procedure ... and establishing a connection with the server computer using the network address found.” The Examiner apparently interprets Lim’s DNS server system 102 and its DNS database 116 to correspond to the claimed “client computer” and “local storage of the client computer” (emphasis added), respectively. (Office Action, p. 3.) Further, the Examiner interprets Lim’s “higher level DNS server system 102” to correspond to the claimed “server computer.” (*Id.*) Based on this correspondence, the Examiner appears to believe that the *Lim's* search of DNS database 116 teaches to the claimed “primary search procedure” and that the recursive translation by “higher level” DNS server system 102 teaches to the claimed “second primary search procedure.” (*Id.*) Applicant respectfully disagrees.

First, DNS server 102 and “higher level” DNS server system 102 cannot be interpreted to correspond the “client computer system” and the “server computer system,” respectively, as recited in claim 52. The terms “client” and “server,” even when taken most broadly, require a relationship in which the “client” is a requestor and the “server” is a supplier that responds to the client’s request. (*See, e.g., "client/server." Computer Desktop Encyclopedia.* Computer Language Company Inc., 2009. Answers.com 14 Jul. 2009.

<http://www.answers.com/topic/client-server-technology>.) One of ordinary skill in the art would not consider “higher level” DNS server system 102 a “server” with regard to DNS server system 102 since, as described above, DNS server system 102 merely passes client system 202’s translation request to “higher level” DNS server system 102. (*Lim* at col. 11:7-17, Fig. 5, step 532.) That is, “higher level” DNS server system 102 does not respond to DNS server system 102. The recursive translation simply passes the translation request to another DNS server which responds directly to client system 202. (*Id.* at col. 2:42-57.) Accordingly, “higher level” DNS server system 102 cannot be considered a “server” with respect to DNS server system 102.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites, “establishing a connection between the client computer and the server computer with the network address found.” In *Lim*, the IP address found by DNS server systems 102 or “higher level” DNS server system 102 represents the address of a entirely different server associated with a symbolic name of a host system 202 included in client system 202’s translation request. (*Lim*, col. 6:8-48; FIG. 2.) For instance, host systems 202 can be mail servers or news servers for client system 202. By contrast, DNS servers 102 do not have symbolic names that are bound to IP addresses which are provided to client system 202. In other words, client system 202 only uses the IP address found by DNS servers systems 102 to connect to host systems 202. But the IP address is not used to connect DNS server systems 102 with “higher level” DNS server system 102.

As noted above, claim 52 incorporates subject matter previously recited in cancelled claim 11. To support the rejection of claim 11, the Examiner alleged that *Lim* “establish[es] a connection with the server computer with the network address found.” (Office Action , p. 5, ¶ 10.) Specifically, the Office Action points to column 8, lines 55-61 of *Lim*, which states:

In step 610, the client DNS process 214 returns the IP address that corresponds to the translation request to the DNS server system 102. In cases where a special record was retrieved from the client DNS database 216, the returned IP address is the IP address generated in step 608. In other cases, the returned IP address is the IP address included in the record retrieved from the client DNS database 216.

However, this portion of *Lim* refers to a different “reflected translation request” performed when a “client-sensitive translation” is required. (*Lim* at col. 7:29-36; Fig. 5, step. 514; Fig. 6.) This translation is entirely different than the “recursive translation” performed by “higher level” DNS server system 102. As such, the “client-sensitive translation” are not included in the steps of the “recursive translation” relied on in the Office Action to reject claim 52. Furthermore, the IP address returned by client system 202 to DNS server system 102 is used to connect the client system to a host system 202, not DNS server system 102. Accordingly, the above-quoted portion of *Lim* also cannot be considered to teach “establishing a connection between the client computer and the server computer with the network address found,” as recited in claim 52. Thus, *Lim* cannot be considered to teach the above noted feature of claim 52 for this reason as well. Moreover, for the same reason, DNS server systems 102 or “higher level” DNS server system 102 cannot be considered to correspond to the claimed “client system” and “server system.”

For all reasons above, *Lim* fails to disclose the “client system” and “server system,” as recited in claim 52. As such, *Lim* cannot be considered to anticipate claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicant, therefore, request that the rejection of claim 52 be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly not being patentable over *Lim* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0168445 by *Pitsos*. Applicant respectfully submits that the references applied in the Office Action cannot support a rejection of claim 1 under Section 103 because, taken individually or in combination, the references do not disclose or suggest all the features recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 recites subject matter similar to the above-noted features recited in claim 52. For instance, claim 1 recites, “searching for a network address of the server computer using a backup search procedure if the address of the server computer cannot be identified by the client computer using a primary search procedure; and establishing a connection between the

client computer and the server computer with the network address found.” Thus, for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 52, *Lim* also fails to teach or suggest these features of claim 1. *Pitsos* does not overcome *Lim*'s deficiencies.

Pitsos discloses a gateway 12 for connecting a remote device 11 in a public network to an internal device 13 in an internal network. (*Pitsos*, Abstract, ¶ 0032, FIG. 1.) The remote device 11 sends data to be transmitted to the internal device 13 via the Internet 14 towards the gateway 12 by using the IP address of the gateway 12. The transmitted data includes unique public key information such as a public key identifier of the internal device's public key. (*Id.* at ¶ 0033.) Gateway 12 stores a list of public key identifiers and associated internal network addresses for identifying a destination of the incoming data which are addressed to Gateway 12's public network address and determines an internal network address of the internal device 13 based on the public key information included in the incoming data as well as the stored list of public key identifiers and associated internal network addresses. Hence, the gateway 12 extracts the relevant public key information from the received data and refers to the stored list in order to determine the destination of the received data. Finally, the incoming data are forwarded to the internal device 13 by the gateway 12.

Because *Pitsos* merely forwards incoming data, it cannot be considered to teach or suggest the above-noted features of claim 1 missing from *Lim*. Indeed, the Office Action simply relies on *Pitsos* for its disclosure of determining an internal network address of the internal device 13 based on the public key information. Accordingly, when *Lim* and *Pitsos* are taken individually or in any combination, these references cannot be considered to teach or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 1. The purported combination of *Lim* and *Pitsos*, therefore, cannot support a rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claims 17, 28, 44, 48, 52, 54, 55 & 57, although of different scope than claim 1, recite subject matter similar to that recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claims 17, 28, 44, 48, 52, 54, 55 & 57 are allowable over the purported combination of *Lim* and *Pitsos* for the same reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Dependent claims 12, 14, 16, 27, 39, 41, 43, 47, 51, 53, 56 & 57 are allowable over purported combination of *Lim* and *Pitsos* at least due to their corresponding dependence from claims 1, 17, 28, 44, 48, 52, 54, 55 & 57

New Claims

Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 58-64 are allowable over the applied references due to their dependence on claims 1, 17, 28, 44, 48, 52 & 54, respectively. In addition, neither *Lim* nor *Pitsos* discloses or suggests “identifying a plurality of replicated server computers having different network addresses,” as recited in claim 58, for example. Accordingly, the subject matter of claims 58- 64 is allowable over the applied references.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: August 17, 2009

By: /Steven Ashburn/
Steven L. Ashburn
Registration No. 56,636

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620

Customer No. 21839